

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHARLES L. McGEE, #L7157

PLAINTIFF

VERSUS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:17-cv-224-LG-RHW

CENTURION MEDICAL SERVICES, et al.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION [19] TO ADD PLAINTIFFS

This cause comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion [19] to Add Plaintiffs filed December 1, 2017. Having reviewed the Motion [19], the record, and relevant case law, Plaintiff's Motion [19] will be denied.

The enactment of the "Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995" (PLRA) militates against multi-plaintiff prisoner complaints. For example, prisoner plaintiffs proceeding *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") are required to pay the full amount of the filing fee and costs. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(b)(1) and (f)(2)(A). Prisoner plaintiffs who have on three or more prior occasions, brought frivolous or malicious complaints or complaints which failed to state a claim may not proceed IFP. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Additionally, multi-prisoner plaintiff complaints present a variety of administrative and logistical problems not associated with other civil actions. See *Beaird v. Lappin*, No. 3:06-cv-967, 2006 WL 2051034, \*3 (N.D. Tex. July 24, 2006) (citations omitted) (noting "impracticalities to include possible transfers of some plaintiffs, security, the need for each plaintiff to sign his own pleading and represent himself, the possibility of changes to documents during circulation among the plaintiffs, the possibility of coercion by other prisoners, and issues raised by the inmates' desire to meet within the prison to discuss joint litigation").

Moreover, “like all persons who claim a deprivation of constitutional rights,” each plaintiff is “required to prove some violation of [his] personal rights.” *Coon v. Ledbetter*, 780 F.2d 1158, 1160-61 (5th Cir. 1986) (citations omitted). Commingling the various claims of multiple plaintiffs makes it difficult for the court to discern how the alleged constitutional violation affected each plaintiff. Meritorious claims may be obscured by the frivolous.

With these concerns in mind, and with the objective of achieving judicial economy and maintaining efficient control of its docket, it is appropriate to deny Plaintiff’s request to add Plaintiffs in this civil action. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion [19] to add Plaintiffs is **denied**.

SO ORDERED, this the 11th day of December, 2017.

*s/ Robert H. Walker*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE